

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheets include changes to Figure 1 and 2. In Figures 1 and 2, the block lengths 58 and 158 are amended to use the correct spelling of the word “length.”

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed May 15, 2007, claims 1-12 were rejected. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims, the canceled claims, the new claims, and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, claims 1, 4, 6-8, 11, and 12 are amended. In particular, claim 1 is amended to clarify the original language of the claim and to include the limitation of claim 3. Accordingly, claim 3 is canceled, and claim 4 is amended to depend directly from claim 1. Claim 6 is also amended to clarify the original language of the claim. Claim 7 is amended to clarify the original language of the claim and to include the limitation of claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 is canceled. Claim 8 is amended to conform to conventional antecedent basis practices. Claims 11 and 12 are amended to clarify the original language of the claims. Claim 13 is added to further recite a ready signal from a bus arbiter. Applicants respectfully submit this amendment is supported by the specification, for example, at page 6, lines 19-22. Claim 14 is added to further recite a tri-state transceiver. Applicants respectfully submit this amendment is supported by the specification, for example, at page 6, lines 23-28. Claim 15 is added to further recite when the processor does not provide bus arbitration. Applicants respectfully submit this amendment is supported by the specification, for example, at page 5, lines 7-9.

As a preliminary matter, while the Office Action provides a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter, the Office Action's statement is directed to specific aspects of certain claims and not necessarily all of the claims. Applicants note that the Office Action's comments may have paraphrased the language of the claims and it should be understood that the language of the claims themselves set out the scope of the claims. Thus, it is noted that the claim language should be viewed in light of the exact language of the claim rather than any paraphrasing or implied limitations thereof.

Objection to the Specification

The Office Action requires a new title that is indicative of the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the title is amended to "USB HOST CONTROLLER

WITH DMA CAPABILITY.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the new title resolves the objection to the specification.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections for the following reasons.

The Office Action states that claims 1 and 7 lack clarity regarding the limitation “sent from the host controller.” Applicants respectfully submit that the indicated language is deleted from the claim. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are moot. Similarly, the rejections of claims 2-6 and 8-10 should be withdrawn insofar as they rely on these rejections of claims 1 and 7.

The Office Action states that claims 6, 11, and 12 are rejected based on lack of positive antecedent bases. Applicants respectfully submit that the indicated language of each of these claims is amended to recite “the DMA controller.” Accordingly, the rejections of claims 6, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nozaki et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0178310, hereinafter Nozaki). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Nozaki and Wynne for the reasons provided below.

Claim 1, 2, and 4-6

Independent claim 1 is amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 3. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 recites allowable subject matter and is patentable over Nozaki.

Claims 2 and 4-6 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claims 2 and 4-6 are

allowable based on an allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 2 and 4-6 may be allowable for further reasons. For example, the Office Action recognizes that each of dependent claims 4 and 5 recites allowable subject matter.

Claim 7-9

Independent claim 7 is amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 7 recites allowable subject matter and is patentable over Nozaki.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claims 8 and 9 are allowable based on an allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 8 and 9 may be allowable for further reasons. For example, the Office Action recognizes that each of dependent claims 8 and 9 recites allowable subject matter.

Claims 11-15

Claim 11 recites “the host controller being adapted such that, in order to retrieve data from the sub-system memory, a starting address and a block length are sent to the DMA controller” (emphasis added) and “the DMA controller being adapted such that, on receipt of the starting address and the block length, the DMA controller retrieves the indicated data from the sub-system memory” (emphasis added).

In contrast, Nozaki does not disclose a DMA controller which retrieves data from a sub-system memory, as recited in the claim. Although the Office Action asserts that the FIFO memory 108 is purportedly the same as the recited sub-system memory, Nozaki does not disclose the DMA controller 104 as retrieving data from the FIFO memory 108. Rather, Nozaki merely describes the DMA controller 104 as writing data from the external memory 102 into the FIFO memory 108. Nozaki, paragraph 52, lines 18-20. In other words, the DMA controller merely retrieves data from the external memory and stores data in the FIFO memory. However, Nozaki does not describe the DMA controller as retrieving data from the FIFO memory. Therefore, Nozaki does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim because Nozaki does not disclose a DMA controller to retrieve data from a sub-system memory, as recited in the claim. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully submit that independent claim 11 recites allowable subject matter and is patentable over Nozaki.

Additionally, Nozaki fails to disclose “the DMA controller being further adapted to send a signal to the processor while the DMA controller is retrieving data from the sub-system memory, the signal to prevent the processor from simultaneously attempting to access the sub-system memory” (emphasis added). In the same way that the DMA controller of Nozaki does not retrieve data from the FIFO memory, the processor of Nozaki also does not retrieve data from or attempt to access the FIFO memory. Therefore, Nozaki further does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim because Nozaki does not disclose a signal to prevent the processor from attempting to access the sub-system memory. Accordingly, Applicants iterate that independent claim 11 recites allowable subject matter and is patentable over Nozaki.

Claims 12-15 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claims 12-15 are allowable based on an allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 12-15 may be allowable for further reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: August 15, 2007

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111